

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT  
SOUTHERN DISTRICT OF NEW YORK

ERNEST CALVINO JR.,

Plaintiff,

-against-

OFFICE OF THE CITY CLERK,

Defendant.

20-CV-0158 (CM)

ORDER OF DISMISSAL

COLLEEN MCMAHON, Chief United States District Judge:

Plaintiff Ernest Calvino Jr. brings this action alleging that Defendant violated his rights. By order dated January 9, 2020, the Court granted Plaintiff's request to proceed without prepayment of fees, that is, *in forma pauperis* (IFP). For the reasons set forth below, the Court dismisses the complaint.

**STANDARD OF REVIEW**

The Court must dismiss an IFP complaint, or portion thereof, that is frivolous or malicious, fails to state a claim on which relief may be granted, or seeks monetary relief from a defendant who is immune from such relief. 28 U.S.C. § 1915(e)(2)(B); *see Livingston v. Adirondack Beverage Co.*, 141 F.3d 434, 437 (2d Cir. 1998). The Court must also dismiss a complaint when the Court lacks subject matter jurisdiction. *See* Fed. R. Civ. P. 12(h)(3). While the law mandates dismissal on any of these grounds, the Court is obliged to construe *pro se* pleadings liberally, *Harris v. Mills*, 572 F.3d 66, 72 (2d Cir. 2009), and interpret them to raise the “strongest [claims] that they suggest,” *Triestman v. Fed. Bureau of Prisons*, 470 F.3d 471, 474-75 (2d Cir. 2006) (internal quotation marks and citations omitted) (emphasis in original).

A claim is frivolous when it “lacks an arguable basis either in law or in fact.” *Neitzke v. Williams*, 490 U.S. 319, 325 (1989), *abrogated on other grounds by Bell Atl. Corp. v. Twombly*,

550 U.S. 544 (2007); *see also Denton v. Hernandez*, 504 U.S. 25, 33 (1992) (holding that “a finding of factual frivolousness is appropriate when the facts alleged rise to the level of the irrational or the wholly incredible”); *Livingston*, 141 F.3d at 437 (“[A]n action is ‘frivolous’ when either: (1) the factual contentions are clearly baseless . . . ; or (2) the claim is based on an indisputably meritless legal theory.”) (internal quotation marks and citation omitted).

## **BACKGROUND**

Plaintiff drafted this complaint using the general complaint form provided by this Court. Plaintiff does not check a box on the form to indicate the basis for federal-court jurisdiction in his case, but in the section in which he is asked to state which of his federal constitutional or federal statutory rights have been violated, he writes: “corruption, obstruction of my legal rights, conspiracy of scam[.]” (ECF No. 2 at 2.)<sup>1</sup> Where asked to list the place(s) of occurrence, Plaintiff writes “Holyoke, Massachusetts. Springfield Massachusetts” and where asked to state the date of occurrence, he leaves that section blank. (*Id.* at 5.)

Plaintiff alleges the following:

I went there a few times asking for information related to me and they said that there was nothing in Holyoke, meaning in the computer of the City of Holyoke, City hall, I ask if I was married there and they said no, I ask about a female friend and nothing, the clerk was a gay person, I went to different room Tax collecte [sic], the Alex Morr. (mayor) there was nothing for me there meaning about information, marrie [sic] records about me and womans [sic] that probably married me there without my sign[.]

(*Id.*)

## **DISCUSSION**

Even when read with the “special solicitude” due *pro se* pleadings, *Triestman*, 470 F.3d at 474-75, Plaintiff’s claims rise to the level of the irrational, and there is no legal theory on which

---

<sup>1</sup> Page numbers refer to those generated by the Court’s electronic case filing system.

he can rely. *See Denton*, 504 U.S. at 33; *Livingston*, 141 F.3d at 437. The Court therefore dismisses this action as frivolous. 28 U.S.C. § 1915(e)(2)(B)(i).

District courts generally grant a *pro se* plaintiff an opportunity to amend a complaint to cure its defects, but leave to amend is not required where it would be futile. *See Hill v. Curcione*, 657 F.3d 116, 123-24 (2d Cir. 2011); *Salahuddin v. Cuomo*, 861 F.2d 40, 42 (2d Cir. 1988). Because the defects in Plaintiff's complaint cannot be cured with an amendment, the Court declines to grant Plaintiff leave to amend.

### **WARNING**

Plaintiff has filed 41 actions in this Court from December 17, 2019, through January 7, 2020. Eleven of these actions have been dismissed as frivolous, and Plaintiff has been warned that further vexatious or frivolous litigation in this Court will result in an order under 28 U.S.C. § 1651 barring him from filing new actions IFP unless he receives prior permission. *See Calvino v. Hadid*, ECF1:20-CV-0138, 4 (S.D.N.Y. Jan. 9, 2020); *Calvino v. Little Wane Father*, ECF 1:20-CV-0134, 4 (S.D.N.Y. Jan. 9, 2020); *Calvino v. Sanchez*, ECF1:20-CV-0065, 4 (S.D.N.Y. Jan. 9, 2020); *Calvino v. Sportefy Inc.*, ECF1:19-CV-11956, 4 (S.D.N.Y. Jan. 9, 2020); *Calvino v. Cirino*, ECF 1:19-CV-11953, 4 (S.D.N.Y. Jan. 7, 2020); *Calvino v. All the women that sue me Int'l and Nat'l*, ECF 1:19-CV-11914, 4 (S.D.N.Y. Jan. 7, 2020); *Calvino v. Salad*, ECF 1:19-CV-11827, 4 (S.D.N.Y. Jan. 7, 2020); *Calvino v. Trainor*, ECF 1:19-CV-11668, 4 (S.D.N.Y. Jan. 7, 2020); *Calvino v. Jones*, ECF 1:19-CV-11601, 3 (S.D.N.Y. Dec. 23, 2019); *see Calvino v. Internal Affe*, ECF 1:19-CV-11611, 3 (S.D.N.Y. Dec. 23, 2019); *Calvino v. Anneka C.*, ECF 1:19-CV-11610, 3 (S.D.N.Y. Dec. 23, 2019).

The Court reiterates the warning.

## CONCLUSION

The Clerk of Court is directed to mail a copy of this order to Plaintiff and note service on the docket.

Plaintiff's complaint is dismissed as frivolous under 28 U.S.C. § 1915(e)(2)(B)(i).

Plaintiff remains warned the further vexatious or frivolous litigation in this Court will result in an order under 28 U.S.C. § 1651 barring him from filing new actions IFP unless he receives prior permission.

The Court certifies under 28 U.S.C. § 1915(a)(3) that any appeal from this order would not be taken in good faith, and therefore IFP status is denied for the purpose of an appeal. *Cf. Coppedge v. United States*, 369 U.S. 438, 444-45 (1962) (holding that an appellant demonstrates good faith when he seeks review of a nonfrivolous issue).

SO ORDERED.

Dated: January 9, 2020  
New York, New York



---

COLLEEN McMAHON  
Chief United States District Judge